



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,170	07/20/2001	Howard Taitel	MWS-041RCE	1865
74321	7590	10/16/2008	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS			ALAM, SHAHID AL	
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Post Office Square				
Boston, MA 02109-2127			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/910,170	Applicant(s) TAITEL, HOWARD
	Examiner Shahid Al Alam	Art Unit 2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 43-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 43-51 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s).Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s).Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 43 – 51 are pending in this Office action.
2. Applicant's argument filed on July 1, 2008 with respect to non-statutory subject matter has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments filed on July 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant argues that Kodosky '729 and Kodosky '187 references are not prior art; '729 reference does not anticipate claimed limitation and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not met.

Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued. Examiner, in his previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

US Patent Application 2003/0195729 filed on May 9, 2003, however it is a continuation of Application No. 09/788,104 filed Feb. 16, 2001 and which is continuation of Application No. 08/912,427 filed on Aug. 18, 1997. Therefore, '729 reference claiming August 18, 1997 priority. Similarly, '187 reference also claiming August 18, 1997 priority. Hence, these two prior art considered as prior art for the instant application. Applicant also argued that there were ongoing patent litigations between the assignee of the 729 reference and the assignee of the pending application. Examiner could not find any such document and Applicant failed to provide such document.

In response to Applicants' argument that '729 reference does not anticipate and does not disclose claimed limitations in the cited section (cited location has nothing to do with applicant's invention). Examiner likes to point out that in the "Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals Inc., 64 USPQ2d 1032 (DC NJ 2002) Decided August 8, 2002."

In the above case it is concluded that the prior art disclosure need not be express in order to anticipate. Even if a prior art inventor does not recognize a function of his or her process, the process can anticipate if that function was inherent. To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency is not necessarily coterminous with the knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art. Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of

the prior art. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. Insufficient prior understanding of the inherent properties of a known composition does not defeat a finding of anticipation.

In response to applicant's argument on page 7, a prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 43, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0195729 issued to Jeffrey Kodosky et al. (hereinafter “729 reference”).

With respect to claims 43, 50 and 51, “729 reference” teaches identifying portions of a model as being critical to a real-time execution of the model; identifying other portions of the model as being non-critical to the real-time execution of the model; generating code for real-time execution based on the critical portions of the model (page 21, claim 36); and

transmitting the generated code for execution on a target (page 21, claims 31 and 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 44 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0195729 issued to Jeffrey Kodosky et al. (hereinafter “729 reference”) and in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0196187 issued to Jeffrey Kodosky et al. (hereinafter “187 reference”).

With respect to claims 44 – 49, “729 reference” teaches claimed inventions substantially as claimed, however, “729 reference” does not explicitly teach non-critical portions are post-processing units; the post-processing units are logical units of the model that have no synchronized data outputs feeding non-post-processing sections of the model; establishing an inter-process communication link between the generated code and the non-critical portions of the model; receiving output from the generated code via the inter-process communications link; executing the code on a target processor associated with the target and processing the output in the non-critical portions of the model as claimed.

The “187 reference” discloses the aforementioned limitations by executing subset of selections designated post processing unit sections (see page 14, claims 23 – 26).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the “729 reference” with the “187 reference” because they are both directed to generation of hardware implementation of graphical code and are both in the same field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because such modification would have allowed the “729 reference” to provide a seamless environment in which the user can develop an embedded application using high level programming technique (see Abstract of the “187 reference”).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Al Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-4030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00 A.M.- 4:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shahid Al Alam/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162
October 14, 2008